# UBT College

# GENERATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE USE POLICY FRAMEWORK

**Prishtina, 26.01.2024**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## 1. GENERAL TRENDS

Between March and September 2023, there has been a significant surge in the adoption of Generative AI (GenAI) tools within the educational sector. Notably, usage among faculty has increased to 22%, while nearly half (49%) of students are utilizing these tools. This marks a considerable growth in faculty engagement since March 2023, although student usage remains higher. A survey indicates that 50% of students perceive GenAI tools positively in terms of their impact on learning, a sentiment less shared by faculty, whose skepticism has somewhat diminished from 50% in spring to 39% in fall. This change suggests an increasing faculty openness to the potential benefits of GenAI in education (Tyton Partners, 2023)

Moreover, both faculty and students recognize the relevance of GenAI tools for professional success. A significant majority of faculty members utilizing AI believe that proficiency in these tools is essential for students' future careers. Approximately 55% of students who use GenAI also acknowledge its necessity for professional achievement. Despite some instructors questioning the utility of GenAI in learning, there is a consensus on its importance for future job preparedness. This scenario calls for intervention by educational leaders and technology providers to reconcile these varying perspectives (Tyton Partners, 2023).

## 2. STUDENT USE OF GENERATIVE AI GLOBALLY

Students utilizing Generative AI (GenAI) tools are finding them beneficial for both their current academic pursuits and future career readiness. The expectation is that as students continue to exchange tips and strategies for GenAI use, there will be an accelerated development in the sophistication of these applications.

According to a recent survey, students who use GenAI sporadically (monthly or weekly) primarily apply these tools to specific educational tasks. The most common uses among these students include summarizing or paraphrasing text, understanding complex concepts, and organizing schedules. On the other hand, students who use GenAI daily demonstrate a more diverse range of applications, extending beyond academic needs to include non-academic activities. This trend suggests that daily GenAI users view these tools as integral to their overall efficiency, not merely as academic aids (Tyton Partners, 2023).

The survey lists the top ten use cases for student learning via GenAI. Among daily users, the leading uses are understanding difficult concepts, summarizing or paraphrasing text, and organizing schedules. For non-daily users, the top uses are similar but also include assisting with writing assignments and answering homework questions. Additionally, students are using GenAI for practical purposes like preparing resumes and job applications, as well as generating materials for study and presentation preparation. This mix of academic and practical applications indicates a growing maturity in how students are integrating GenAI tools into their daily routines, recognizing their potential to streamline both learning and non-academic tasks (Tyton Partners, 2023).

## 3. FACULTY USE GLOBALLY

### Faculty Usage of GenAI Tools:

- Only 22% of faculty members are currently using GenAI tools. Their primary motivation is to understand how students interact with these tools and to instruct students on their effective use (Tyton Partners, 2023).
- Faculty also believe that GenAI skills will be essential for students' future professional success. This belief drives their efforts in educating students about GenAI (Ibid).

### Applications of GenAI in Faculty Activities:

- Faculty members are incorporating GenAI tools in their teaching and administrative tasks. This includes creating class activities, writing syllabi, developing rubrics and assessments, adapting text, responding to student queries, and assisting in grading student work(Tyton Partners, 2023)..
- However, this integration is not yet widespread (Tyton Partners, 2023).

### Faculty's Attitudes towards Students' GenAI Use:

- Most faculty who use AI are open to students using these tools for brainstorming ideas, outlining structures, and editing writing assignments (Tyton Partners, 2023).
- About 20% of AI-using faculty allow students to use GenAI even for drafting small parts or the first drafts of entire assignments (Tyton Partners, 2023).

### Comparison of Faculty and Student Use of GenAI:

- There is a discrepancy between the extent of GenAI usage by faculty and students. Only a small percentage of faculty (2% of non-users and 6% of AI users) permit extensive use of GenAI for writing large parts of assignments. In contrast, 27% of AI-using students report using GenAI for significant portions of their writing assignments (Tyton Partners, 2023).
- Almost half of the AI-using students utilize these tools for writing smaller sections of their assignments, exceeding the limits set by most faculty members (Tyton Partners, 2023).

### Faculty Thresholds for GenAI Use in Writing:

- Despite allowing GenAI for various purposes, faculty have clear limits regarding its use in coursework, especially in writing. Short answer questions and essays are common assessment techniques, used by 61% and 45% of faculty, respectively (Tyton Partners, 2023).

- .When employing AI detection tools, faculty typically allow up to 30% of content to be AI-generated in student work before raising concerns about academic integrity. This threshold is slightly higher for faculty who use AI themselves (Tyton Partners, 2023).

## 4. GENAI POLICY MAKING AT HIGHER EDUCATION – CURRENT SITUATION

The survey conducted by Tyton Partners sponsored by Turnitin explores the current status of institutional policy-making regarding Generative AI (GenAI) tools in higher education. The summary of the survey answers are presented below:

1. **Institutional Policy-Making on GenAI Tools:**
   - Policies regarding the use of GenAI tools are mainly established at the institutional level (25%) and at the individual course level (21%).
   - Faculty who use AI are more inclined to regulate the use of GenAI (57%) compared to those who do not use AI (45%). Furthermore, AI-using faculty are less likely to ban GenAI tools (7%) in contrast to 23% of non-AI-using faculty. This suggests that faculty with firsthand experience of GenAI tend to have a more nuanced understanding of its potential benefits for learning.

2. **Policy-Making Trends by Institution Type:**
   - Private 4-year institutions are more inclined to delegate GenAI policy decisions to individual faculty at the course level (32% compared to 21% overall).
   - In 2-year institutions, the presence of GenAI policies is generally lower.

3. **Comparison of Policy Adoption with Student Usage:**
   - There's a noticeable lag in policy-making compared to the pace of student adoption of GenAI tools. This delay in systematic policy development concerning AI in education has been highlighted by the WICHE Cooperative for Educational Technologies (WCET).
   - Current policies mainly focus on academic integrity issues. However, there are concerns that these policies do not adequately address other critical aspects, such as bias in large language models and the lack of accessibility features (e.g., text-to-speech for visually impaired users).

4. **Need for Enhanced Policies and Collaboration:**
   - The findings indicate a need for more comprehensive and inclusive GenAI policies. It also suggests a necessity for collaboration and knowledge sharing among institutions to develop well-rounded policies that address various facets of GenAI usage in education.

## 5. EXISTING POLICIES ON AI AND FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS

AI's expansion into various sectors raises concerns about risks such as discrimination, privacy loss, human rights violations, and malicious use (AI regulation, 2023; WEF, 2023; Greiman, 2021; Hogenhout, 2021). Misuse of AI could lead to societal manipulation, division, and inequality (Federspiel et al., 2023). In response to these risks, countries are developing policies to guide AI

usage, focusing on maximizing benefits and mitigating threats. National strategies primarily address AI's ethical aspects, which involve standards of right and wrong (Hogenhout, 2021).

In this regard, Floridi (2021) proposes five core ethical principles for AI use: beneficence, non-maleficence, autonomy, justice, and explicability. In this regard, Nordic countries' adopted AI strategies that emphasize various ethical principles as foundational (Dexe & Franke, 2020). Furthermore, Singapore's AI governance framework stresses explainable, transparent, and fair AI usage and human-centric solutions (IMDA & PDPC, 2020). Nonetheless, UNESCO guidelines focus on human-centered AI, advocating for adherence to human rights and values stated in the UDHR (UNESCO, 2021b, 2023). Finally, the EU's AI strategy underlines a human-centric approach, establishing pillars for AI trustworthiness and forming an expert group for policy recommendations (Renda, 2020).

There are several challenges related to implementation of AI policies as presented below:

- Defining universal ethical principles is challenging, hindering policy formulation (Dexe & Franke, 2020).
- The broad impact of AI in various sectors, from governance to education, complicates specific policy development (UNESCO, 2021b).
- Singapore's framework suggests flexibility in applying model frameworks or ethical guidelines according to specific situations (IMDA & PDPC, 2020).

Therefore, the future directions on policy development will revolve around:

- Ongoing national and international efforts focusing on legal and ethical principles (AI regulation, 2023; UNESCO, 2023).
- Current principles being predictive and prescriptive, await validation through real-time AI implementation (Chatterjee, 2020).
- Establishing institutional support systems is necessary for effective AI management (Renda, 2020).

## 6. EXISTING POLICIES ON AI IN EDUCATION

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in education, ongoing since the 1970s, is widespread across various educational contexts today. AI technologies are used in personalized learning applications, assessments, and administrative systems (Al Braiki et al., 2020; Schiff, 2022; UNESCO, 2021a). However, the application of AI in education has raised several concerns including changes in assessment and curriculum design, equal access to technology, redefinition of teacher roles, and technological infrastructure challenges in emerging economies (Pelletier et al., 2022; Popenici & Kerr, 2017; Swiecki et al., 2022; TEQSA, 2023; UNESCO, 2021a).

AI education policies focus on issues such as digital literacy to prevent inequalities (Southgate, 2020; UNESCO, 2021b), maintaining traditional teaching values (Luan et al., 2020; UNESCO, 2021b), ensuring inclusivity and equity (Tanveer et al., 2020; UNESCO, 2021a), developing

teacher competencies (Ocaña-Fernández et al., 2019; Wang et al., 2021), and providing student training in relevant skills (Pelletier et al., 2022; UNESCO, 2021a). However, policies on AI in education are generally broad and implicit due to a lack of concrete implementation evidence (UNESCO, 2021a). Schiff (2022) observed that global AI policy discourse often views education as a tool for workforce development rather than addressing AI's role in education. There is a lack of attention to AI scholarship and governance in current literature (Gellai, 2022) and a limited public understanding of AI policy implications (Feldstein, 2019).

To this end, the UNESCO framework emphasizes a humanistic approach, focusing on human rights, skill development, and effective human-machine collaboration (UNESCO, 2021a). Key recommendations from UNESCO include interdisciplinary planning, equitable and ethical AI use, developing a master plan for AI in education management, pilot testing and evaluation, and fostering local AI innovations (UNESCO, 2021a).

## 7. COLLEGE UBT POLICY FRAMEWORK ON USE OF GENERATIVE AI IN TEACHING, LEARNING, ADMINISTRATION, AND RESEARCH

The UBT Policy on Generative AI for education encompasses three key dimensions: Pedagogical, Governance, and Operational, each focusing on different aspects of AI integration in university settings:

### 1. Pedagogical Dimension (Teachers):

This dimension addresses the teaching and learning aspects of AI integration.

- Key areas include rethinking assessments, developing holistic student competencies, preparing students for AI-driven workplaces, and encouraging balanced AI adoption.
- Teachers are responsible for designing AI-inclusive curricula and fostering ethical AI usage among students.

### 2. Governance Dimension (Senior Management):

This dimension involves governance considerations like academic misconduct, data privacy, and ethical dilemmas related to AI.

- Key focus areas are understanding and preventing academic misconduct, addressing governance issues like data privacy, attributing AI technologies, and ensuring equitable AI access.
- Senior management is tasked with developing policies and guidelines that address these ethical concerns.

3. **Operational Dimension (Teaching, Learning, and IT Staff):**

This dimension concentrates on the practical aspects of AI implementation.

- It includes monitoring AI implementation, providing AI literacy training, and offering support.
- Teaching and IT staff manage and maintain AI technologies, ensuring seamless integration into educational environments.
- The framework emphasizes collaboration among stakeholders, including universities, teachers, students, staff, and external bodies, for successful AI policy implementation. It aims to ensure responsible and ethical AI usage while maximizing its benefits.

4. **Digital Literacy and AI Ethics Education**:
   - Development of comprehensive digital literacy curriculum that includes AI ethics, focusing on responsible use, understanding biases in AI, and recognizing the limitations of AI tools.
   - Mandatory training modules for both students and faculty on ethical AI usage, data privacy, and recognizing AI-generated content.

5. **Academic Integrity Guidelines:**
   - Adoption of clear guidelines on the use of GenAI tools in academic work, detailing what constitutes acceptable and unacceptable use.
   - Implementation of AI detection tools to identify AI-generated content in student submissions, while educating students on the importance of originality and intellectual property.

6. **Faculty Development Programs:**
   - Regular professional development workshops for faculty to keep them abreast of the latest GenAI advancements and their pedagogical applications.
   - Encouragement of faculty experimentation with GenAI tools in curriculum development, research, and assessment design.

7. **Student-Centered AI Learning Tools:**
   - Integration of AI tools that support personalized learning, offering tailored educational experiences based on individual student needs and learning styles.
   - Pilot projects to test the effectiveness of AI tools in enhancing learning outcomes in various disciplines.

8. **Equitable Access to AI Resources:**
   - Ensuring all students, regardless of socio-economic background, have access to necessary AI tools and technologies.
   - Provision of training and support to ensure equitable digital competencies among students.

## 9. POLICY GUIDELINES ON GEN AI IN TEACHING, ASSESSMENT, AND RESEARCH

The College UBT encourages the critical and ethical use of AI tools in academic work, emphasizing the importance of original thought and analysis.

**Guidelines for Professors**

1. Adoption in Course Design:
   - Professors must provide clear guidelines in the syllabus regarding the permissible use of GenAI in their courses.

2. **Assessment Policy:**
   a. Design of assignments and essays in the way that require critical thinking, reducing the potential for GenAI to replace student effort.
   b. Reduce the descriptive method in essays and writing assignments. Use critical essays and ask from students to defend their papers and assignments in class;
   c. GenAI can be used by students as a tutor for complex problem-solving. Professors should provide harder problem solving sets bearing in mind that students can use Ai tutorship to solve problems both in social and exact sciences;
3. **Research Guidelines:**
   - If used for a part of research, both students and professors must transparency and proper citation adhering to standards of academic integrity of appropriate journal and publishing house.

**For Students:**

1. Use in Academic Work:
   - Must cite any use of GenAI in assignments, as per the specific course policy. The permissible yse of AI in writing assignments can be from 0-20 %/
   - Prohibited from using GenAI to substantially complete assignments or exams.
   - Use of more than 20 % of GenAI content shall be considered as plagiarism and be subject to ethical procedures as per the Code of Ethics of College UBT.
   - Students are allowed to use AI tools for study purposes, such as creating study guides or understanding difficult concepts, in accordance with course policies.
   - Misuse of AI tools in a manner that substitutes genuine engagement with coursework is discouraged.
   - Students must acknowledge and cite any use of AI tools in their assignments, including the nature of the assistance received.
   - A citation convention should be used as per Regulation of UBT on Bachelor and Master Thesis;

Policies and guidelines on AI tool usage at UBT will be periodically reviewed and updated in response to the evolving landscape of AI technologies.

## REFERENCES


- Abduljabbar, R., Dia, H., Liyanage, S., & Bagloee, S. A. (2019). Applications of artificial intelligence in transport: An overview. Sustainability, 11(1), 189. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11010189
- Adiguzel, T., Kaya, M. H., & Cansu, F. K. (2023). Revolutionizing education with AI: Exploring the transformative potential of ChatGPT. Contemporary Educational Technology, 15(3), ep429. https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/13152
- AI regulation (2023). Legal and Ethical Aspects of ChatGPT: EU Parliament's Amendment, French Experts' Opinion on Ethical Issues and Other Useful Resources. Retrieved from https://ai-regulation.com/legal-and-ethical-aspects-of-chatgpt/
- Al Braiki, B., Harous, S., Zaki, N., & Alnajjar, F. (2020). Artificial intelligence in education and assessment methods. Bulleting of Electrical Engineering and Informatics, 9(5), 1998–2007. https://doi.org/10.11591/eei.v9i5.1984
- Aoun, J. E. (2017). Robot-proof: Higher education in the age of artificial intelligence. The MIT Press.
- Atlas, S. (2023). ChatGPT for higher education and professional development: A guide to conversational AI. https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/cba_facpubs/548
- Bholat, D., & Susskind, D. (2021). The assessment: Artificial intelligence and financial services. Oxford Review of Economic Policy, 37(3), 417–434. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxrep/grab015
- Buckley, R. P., Zetzsche, D. A., Arner, D. W., & Tang, B. W. (2021). Regulating artificial intelligence in finance: Putting the human in the loop. The Sydney Law Review, 43(1), 43–81.
- Cassidy, C. (2023). Universities to return to pen and paper exams after students caught using AI to write essays. The Guardian. https://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2023/jan/10/universities-to-return-to-pen-and-paper-exams-after-students-caught-using-ai-to-write-essays
- Cavendish, C. (2023). ChatGPT will force school exams out of the dark ages. Financial Times. https://www.ft.com/content/41243091-d8d7-4b74-9ad1-5341c16c869f
- Chan, C.K.Y. (2023). Is AI changing the rules of academic misconduct? An in-depth look at students' perceptions of 'AI-giarism'. https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.03358
- Chan, C. K. Y., & Hu, W. (2023). Students' voices on generative AI: Perceptions, benefits, and challenges in higher education. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2305.00290
- Chan, CKY & Chen, S. (2023). Student Partnership in Assessment in Higher Education: A Systematic Review. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2023.2224948
- Chan, C. K. Y., & Lee, K. K. W. (2023). The AI generation gap: Are Gen Z students more interested in adopting generative AI such as ChatGPT in teaching and learning than their Gen X and Millennial Generation teachers? arxiv:2305.02878
- Chan, C. K. Y., & Tsi, L. H. Y. (2023). The AI Revolution in Education: Will AI Replace or Assist Teachers in Higher Education? [Preprint]. arxiv:2305.01185

- Chan, C. K. Y., & Zhou, W. (2023). Deconstructing Student Perceptions of Generative AI (GenAI) through an Expectancy Value Theory (EVT)-based Instrument [Preprint]. arxiv:2305.01186
- Chatterjee, S. (2020). AI strategy of India: Policy framework, adoption challenges and actions for government. Transforming Government, 14(5), 757–775. https://doi.org/10.1108/TG-05-2019-0031
- Civil, B. (2023, March 16). ChatGPT can hinder students' critical thinking skills: Artificial intelligence is changing how students learn to write. The Queen's Journal. https://www.queensjournal.ca/story/2023-03-16/opinions/chatgpt-can-hinder-students-critical-thinking-skills/
- Cotton, D. R. E., Cotton, P. A., & Shipway, J. R. (2023). Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT. Innovations in Education and Teaching International. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2190148
- Dexe, J., & Franke, U. (2020). Nordic lights? National AI policies for doing well by doing good. Journal of Cyber Policy, 5(3), 332–349. https://doi.org/10.1080/23738871.2020.1856160
- Eggmann, F., Weiger, R., Zitzmann, N. U., & Blatz, M. B. (2023). Implications of large language models such as ChatGPT for dental medicine. Journal of Esthetic and Restorative Dentistry. https://doi.org/10.1111/jerd.130
- Federspiel, F., Mitchell, R., Asokan, A., Umana, C., & McCoy, D. (2023). Threats by artificial intelligence to human health and human existence. BMJ Global Health, 8(5), e010435. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2022-010435
- Feldstein, S. (2019). The road to digital unfreedom: How artificial intelligence is reshaping repression. Journal of Democracy, 30(1), 40–52. https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.2019.0003
- Floridi, L. (2021). A Unified Framework of Five Principles for AI in Society. In Ethics, Governance, and Policies in Artificial Intelligence (Vol. 144, pp. 5–17). Springer International Publishing AG. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-81907-1_2
- Gellai, D. B. (2022). Enterprising academics: Heterarchical policy networks for artificial intelligence in British higher education. ECNU Review of Education. https://doi.org/10.1177/20965311221143798
- Greiman, V. A. (2021). Human rights and artificial intelligence: A universal challenge. Journal of Information Warfare, 20(1), 50–62.
- Hogenhout, L. (2021). A Framework for Ethical AI at the United Nations. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2104.12547
- IMDA & PDPC (2020). Model Artificial Intelligence Governance Framework. Retrieved from https://www.pdpc.gov.sg/-/media/files/pdpc/pdf-files/resource-for-organisation/ai/sgmodelaigovframework2.pdf
- Intelligent.com. (2023, January 23). Nearly 1 in 3 College Students Have Used ChatGPT on Written Assignments. https://www.intelligent.com/nearly-1-in-3-college-students-have-used-chatgpt-on-written-assignments/
- Kasneci, E., Seßler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., & Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. Learning and Individual Differences, 103, 102274.

- Korn, J. & Kelly, S. (2023, January 5). New York City public schools ban access to AI tool that could help students cheat. CNN. https://edition.cnn.com/2023/01/05/tech/chatgpt-nyc-school-ban/index.html
- Luan, H., Geczy, P., Lai, H., Gobert, J., Yang, S. J. H., Ogata, H., Baltes, J., Guerra, R., Li, P., & Tsai, C.-C. (2020). Challenges and future directions of big data and artificial intelligence in education. Frontiers in Psychology, 11, 580820. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.580820
- Luckin, R. (2017). Towards artificial intelligence-based assessment systems. Nature Human Behaviour, 1, 0028. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-016-0028
- McKinsey Consultant. (2023). What is generative AI? [Article]. Retrieved February 12, 2023, from https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/mckinsey-explainers/what-is-generative-ai
- Ocaña-Fernández, Y., Valenzuela- Fernández, L. A., & Garro-Aburto, L. L. (2019). Artificial intelligence and its implications in higher education. Journal of Educational Psychology, 7(2), 553–568. https://doi.org/10.20511/pyr2019.v7n2.274
- Oliver, J. (2023). John Oliver on new AI programs: 'The potential and the peril here are huge'. The Guardian. https://www.theguardian.com/tv-and-radio/2023/feb/27/john-oliver-new-ai-programs-potential-peril
- Pelletier, K., McCormack, M., Reeves, J., Robert, J., Arbino, N., Al-Freih, M., Dickson-Deane, C., Guevara, C., Koster, L., Sánchez-Mendiola, M., Bessette, L. S., & Stine, J. (2022). EDUCAUSE Horizon Report, teaching and learnig edition. EDUCAUSE.
- Popenici, S. A. D., & Kerr, S. (2017). Exploring the impact of artificial intelligence on teaching and learning in higher education. Research and Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning, 12, 22. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41039-017-0062-8
- Renda, A. (2020). Europe: Toward a Policy Framework for Trustworthy AI. In M. D. Dubber, F. Pasquale, & S. Das (Eds.), The Oxford Handbook of Ethics of AI (pp. 650–666). Oxford Academic. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190067397.013.41
- Sam, A. K., & Olbrich, P. (2023). The need for AI ethics in higher education. In C. C. Corrigan, S. A. Asakipaam, J. J. Kponyo, & C. Luetge (Eds.), AI ethics in higher education: Insights from Africa and beyond (pp. 3–10). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-23035-6_1
- Schiff, D. (2022). Education for AI, not AI for Education: The Role of Education and Ethics in National AI Policy Strategies. International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education, 32(3), 527–563. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-021-00270-2
- Sinhaliz, S., Burdjaco, Z., & Du Preez, J. (2023). How ChatGPT Could Revolutionize Academia. IEEE Spectrum. https://spectrum.ieee.org/how-chatgpt-could-revolutionize-academia
- Southgate, E. (2020). Artificial intelligence, ethics, equity and higher education: A "beginning-of-the-discussion" paper. National Centre for Student Equity in Higher Education, Curtin University, and the University of Newcastle. http://ncsehe.edu.au/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/Southgate_AI-Equity-Higher-Education_FINAL.pdf
- Swiecki, Z., Khosravi, H., Chen, G., Martinez-Maldonado, R., Lodge, J. M., Milligan, S., Selwyn, N., & Gašević, D. (2022). Assessment in the age of artificial intelligence.

Computers and Education Artificial Intelligence, 3, 100075. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2022.100075

- Tanveer, M., Hassan, S., & Bhaumik, A. (2020). Academic policy regarding sustainability and artificial intelligence (AI). Sustainability, 12(22), 9435. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12229435
- TEQSA (February 28, 2023). Artificial Intelligence: advice for students. Retrieved from https://www.teqsa.gov.au/students/artificial-intelligence-advice-students
- Tyton Partners. (2023). GenAI in Higher Education: Fall 2023 Update of Time for Class Study. Tyton Partners. Sponsored by Turnitin.
- UNESCO. (2021a). AI and education: Guidance for policy-makers. UNESCO.
- UNESCO. (2021b). Recommendations on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence. UNESCO.
- UNESCO (2023). Ethics of Artificial Intelligence. Retrieved from https://www.unesco.org/en/artificial-intelligence/recommendation-ethics
- Wang, S., Wang, G., Chen, X., Wang, W., & Ding, X. (2021). A review of content analysis on China artificial intelligence (AI) education policies. In W. Wang, G. Wang, X. Ding, & B. Zhang (Eds.), Artificial intelligence in education and teaching assessment (pp. 1–8). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-6502-8_1
- Warschauer, M., Tseng, W., Yim, S., Webster, T., Jacob, S., Du, Q, & Tate, T. (2023). The affordances and contradictions of AI-generated text for second language writers. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4404380
- Wood, P. (2023, February 28). Oxford and Cambridge ban AI language tool GPT-3 over fears of plagiarism. inews.co.uk. https://inews.co.uk/news/oxford-cambridge-ban-chatgpt-plagiarism-universities-2178391
- World Economic Forum. (2023). Model Artificial Intelligence Governance Framework and Assessment Guide. Retrieved from https://www.weforum.org/projects/model-ai-governance-framework
- Wu, J., Wang, X., Dang, Y., & Lv, Z. (2022). Digital twins and artificial intelligence in transportation infrastructure: Classification, application, and future research directions. Computers and Electrical Engineering, 101, 107983. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compeleceng.2022.107983
- Yau, C., & Chan, K. (2023, February 17). University of Hong Kong temporarily bans students from using ChatGPT, other AI-based tools in coursework. South China Morning Post. https://www.scmp.com/news/hong-kong/education/article/3210650/university-hong-kong-temporarily-bans-students-using-chatgpt-other-ai-based-tools-coursework
- Yu, K.-H., Beam, A. L., & Kohane, I. S. (2018). Artificial intelligence in healthcare. Nature Biomedical Engineering, 2, 719–731. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41551-018-0305-z
- Zhai, X. (2022). ChatGPT user experience: Implications for education. Available at SSRN 4312418.